in supporting it. Why do parties exist if not to support good causes ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I am not accusing anybody or any institution and I am not making any allegation against anybody. I am stating only facts and the facts are these. Therefore this is not a case to which the Home Minister's attention is to be called.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—The Home Minister was pleased to say that the P. S. P. is supporting the Samyukta Karnatak Kannada Sangh. What is the source of information of the Home Minister to make this statement ? Will he substantiate it ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before the Minister answers the point, I want to ask the Hon. Member whether he disputes his statement. If he disputes I will call upon him to reply. Otherwise I am not going to permit him.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Unless the Home Minister divulges his source of information, how can we dispute it ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Leader of the P. S. P. in the Legislature has said that they are supporting this institution and all good causes.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—The Home Minister has said that the P. S. P. is supporting this institution. What is the source of information on which he has said this ? I want a clarification on that point.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—The keen interest shown by so many members of the P. S. P. here on the floor of the House is itself proof of that.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri R. M. PATIL. (Minister for Home).—I beg to lay on the table Notification No. HD 58 (2) TMT, 62 dated 4th June 1962 (Exemption of Tax payable in respect of the Motor Vehicle of Mr. Edward V. Wood, T.C.M. Expert), as required under Section 16 (2) of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1957.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Sir, I am making a request for the past 10 days to get a reply from the Education Minister for an inconsistent statement made by him.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member has been saying that there is some contradiction with regard to facts.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—I do not know what exactly is the point because neither the member nor the Secretary has communicated to me what is the inconsistency about it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Shall I ask him to state his point ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, there are 3 Additional Joint Directors and their duties and responsibilities have not been clarified. They are treated just like Head Clerks. They have to work under the D. P. I. to whom every paper has to go. They are just like case workers in the Secretariat. I want to know what is their position, what is their status and what are their duties and responsibilities. The other day when I raised the point the Education Minister was pleased to reply that there is a notification and the Chair directed to please give me a fresh copy of it and asked me to go through it. I went about for one full week, but there is no such notification and there is no such clarification. There is no such direction from Government. The matter of assigning duties and responsibilities is pending before Government. I have brought it to your notice. I have sent you 3 letters in this connection. I have requested the Chair and the Government through the Chair for a clarification, but till today the Education Minister has not come forward with a definite reply. I want to know whether his statement is correct or not.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Hon'ble member uses a language which is rather strange. I do not know what is the inconsistency. If I do not know what I have got to reply to, how can I reply? I have only now come to know what he wants me to say. He

means to say that the three Joint Directors have not been assigned work. In the first place, that is incorrect. They have been assigned work. Pending Government Order the D.P.I. has assigned work to them and I have got a copy of the D.P,I.'s order. He says "Pending Government Order I am making the following distribution of work between the Joint Directors." That being so, I do not see any inconsistency. I never said that Government had allotted them work. I only said that they have been distributed work.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—When I asked for clarification he said that there is a Government notification. Is it by the D. P. I. or by Government? That is what I wanted to know.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Whether it is from the Government or from the D.P.I that does not matter. Work has been assigned and there is a notification.

Sri C J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is it the D.P.I. or the Government which has the authority to assign duties and responsibilities?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Hon. member's query is quite strange. Pending Government Order the D.P.I. is entitled to assign work. Does the Hon. member mean that the D P.I. should wait for the Government Order and not allot work to them pending Government Order?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I have given all 3 papers issued by the D.P.I. to you. They do not show what are the duties and responsibilities assigned to them.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not read the notification. Now I understand what the point of the hon'ble member is. He says that there has been no distribution of work amongst the 3 Joint Directors, but the Minister says that there is distribution of work and that is only a tentative or interim arrangement pending final orders of Government. Pending Government order, it is not illegal to make an interim arrangement and I do not find any inconsistency, but I will look into all the papers.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Before you finally conclude, Sir, I wish to state that after the letter was issued, another Joint Director was appointed. The person who was working as Headquarters Assistant to the D.P.I. has been appointed as a Joint Director and he has not been assigned any duties and resposibilities. Even after the appointment of the 3rd Joint Director the Government have made no clear-cut allocation of work and duties and responsibilities between them and so we are at a loss to know what are the duties and responsibilities of each of them. That is why I say that there is an inconsistency in the statement of the Education Minister when he says that there is a notification about the distribution of work.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What has happened after the statement of the Education Minister, namely, the appointment of a fresh Joint Director cannot possibly be said as an inconsistency in the first statement made by the Minister.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—There is no inconsistency at all. I do not know how the inconsistency arises at all. The work has to be allotted and it has been allotted to those officers. I have myself looked into the whole thing and I have not found any inconsistency. There may be a sort of overlapping here and there that is bound to happen. There cannot be a water-tight compartment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೂ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಬ್ಬರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೂರನೆಯವರ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಕೇಳಿದರೂ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ದೊರೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನದು ತಪ್ಪಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member was a bit impatient. I said that I was myself going to look into it.

— ——